

Geometric Analysis on the Diederich-Fornæss Index

Steven G. Krantz
sk@math.wustl.edu

Bingyuan Liu
bingyuan@ucr.edu

Marco Peloso
marco.peloso@unimi.it

July 26, 2016

Abstract

We derive a sufficient condition on a bounded pseudoconvex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with smooth boundary such that $-(-\rho)^\eta$ is plurisubharmonic on Ω for $\eta > 0$ arbitrarily close to 1 (the supremum of η is called Diederich-Fornæss index, see Definition 0.1). This condition (see Theorem 0.1) extends a theorem of Fornæss and Herbig in 2007 and only requires restriction on Levi-flat sets of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Since the condition is on Levi-flat sets, it contains more geometric information. As an application of this new condition, we discuss how the geometry of the Levi-flat sets affects the Diederich-Fornæss index. Among other results, we show that the Diederich-Fornæss index is 1 if only the Levi-flat sets form a real curve transversal to the holomorphic tangent vector fields on $\partial\Omega$ (see Theorem 0.2). We also give a specific example (see Theorem 5.2) on the bounded pseudoconvex domains which verify the application but are neither of finite type nor admit a plurisubharmonic defining function on the boundary.

0 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with smooth boundary. It is well known that the domain admits a plurisubharmonic function $-\log(-\delta(z))$, where δ is defined to be $-\text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$ and is a defining function of Ω . This is a key part of Oka's theorem. However, the function $-\log(-\delta(z))$ is unbounded when z approaches the boundary, which make some analysis on the boundary of the domain intractable. In 1977, Diederich and Fornæss showed in ("Pseudoconvex domains: bounded strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions") that a bounded, plurisubharmonic exhaustion function exists for any bounded pseudoconvex domain with smooth boundary. Their idea uses $-(-\rho)^\eta$ instead of $-\log(-\delta(z))$, where ρ is some defining function for Ω and $0 < \eta < 1$. In this case, $-(-\rho)^\eta$ will approach 0 when z goes to boundary, even if it will not be smooth at the boundary. The existence of bounded plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions was later generalized to C^1 boundary by Kerzman and Rosay in ("Fonctions plurisousharmoniques d'exhaustion bornées et domaines taut") and to Lipschitz boundary by Demailly in ("Mesures de Monge-Ampère et mesures pluriharmoniques"). Their method is to locally translate $-\log(-\delta)$ in a direction transversal to the boundary. Harrington in ("The order of plurisubharmonicity") is able to refine the technique of translation of $-\log(-\delta)$ to obtain the theorem of Diederich-Fornæss in the case of Lipschitz boundary in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Recently, he generalized his result to $\mathbb{CP}^n$ in ("Bounded Plurisubharmonic Exhaustion Functions for Lipschitz Pseudoconvex Domains in $\mathbb{CP}^n$ "). Moreover, the Diederich-Fornæss index is known to be related to $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem closely. For this topic, see the book written by Straube (*Lectures on the L^2 -Sobolev theory of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*) and the survey of Boas and Straube ("Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem: a survey of the L^2 -Sobolev theory"). Also, two papers of Gallagher (previously known as Herbig) and McNeal in ("Convex defining functions for convex domains") and ("Oka's lemma, convexity, and intermediate positivity conditions") include some interesting results.

On the other hand, it turns out that it is of great interest, on a given domain to optimize the exponent in $-(-\rho)^\eta$. We now introduce the Diederich-Fornæss index.

Definition 0.1. Let Ω be a bounded, pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The number $0 < \tau_\rho < 1$ is called a *Diederich-Fornæss exponent* if there exists a defining function ρ of Ω so that $-(-\rho)^{\tau_\rho}$ is plurisubharmonic. The index

$$\eta := \sup \tau_\rho,$$

where the supremum is taken over all defining functions of Ω , is called the *Diederich-Fornæss index* of the domain Ω .

In (“A note on plurisubharmonic defining functions in $\mathbb{C}^2$ ”), Fornæss and Gallagher proved that if the defining function of a domain is plurisubharmonic on the boundary, then the Diederich-Fornæss index is 1. The converse is not always true. That is, if a domain has Diederich-Fornæss index 1, it does not necessarily admit a defining function which is plurisubharmonic on the boundary. The latter statement was proved by (“Plurisubharmonic defining functions of weakly pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ ”) where Behrens gives an example of a domain which does not admit a defining function that is plurisubharmonic on the boundary but the Diederich-Fornæss index is 1. Another work related to the Diederich-Fornæss index being 1 is the one of Diederich and Fornæss (“Pseudoconvex domains: existence of Stein”). In their paper, they have shown the Diederich-Fornæss index is 1 if the pseudoconvex domain is regular. This condition has many applications in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with $n \geq 3$ or with real analytic boundary which is not what we consider here.

The motivation behind our paper is an intention to extend the result of Fornæss and Gallagher. More precisely, one can ask the following questions:

- Questions.**
1. *Can one find a more general condition than plurisubharmonicity of defining function on boundary to guarantee the Diederich-Fornæss index is 1? This condition should cover the example of Behrens.*
 2. *On the other hand, how can one realize the condition from a geometric point of view?*
 3. *Can one give an example on the bounded domains admitting Diederich-Fornæss index 1, but the domain is pseudoconvex, not of finite type and does not admit a plurisubharmonic defining function on the boundary?*

For Question 1, we will answer it with the following theorem. The proof will be in Section 3. Please also have a look at Section 1 and Section 2 for basic notations.

Theorem 0.1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Let Σ denote the Levi-flat set in $\partial\Omega$. Assume that there exists a defining function ρ of Ω such that, on Σ , we have the condition $\text{Hess}_\rho(L, N) = 0$ where L is the normalized holomorphic tangential vector field of $\partial\Omega$ and N is the normalized complex normal vector field of $\partial\Omega$. Then the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1.*

Remark 1. In practice, we do not need to assume that the L, N are normalized vectors. This is because $\text{Hess}_\rho(L, N)$ is tensorial, that is, $\text{Hess}_\rho(fL, gN) = f\bar{g} \text{Hess}_\rho(L, N) = 0$ for arbitrary functions f and g .

For Question 2, we have to introduce some of our conventions. Namely, we will call a simple curve a *real curve* if it can be parametrized by a smooth map $\Psi : t \mapsto \mathbb{C}^2$. Also, for the definition and discussion of transversality, see Section 1.

We are ready to answer Question 2 with a series of results as what follows. All of these will be discussed in Section 4.

Theorem 0.2. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Let Σ denote the set of Levi-flat points in $\partial\Omega$. Assume that Σ is a real curve and transversal to the holomorphic tangent vector of $\partial\Omega$. Then the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1.*

Corollary 0.1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Let Σ denote the set of Levi-flat points in $\partial\Omega$. Assume that Σ is a set of isolated points. Then the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1.*

Remark 2. It is not hard to see also that if the set of Levi-flats points consists of finite many isolated points and finite many disjoint real curves transversal to the holomorphic vector fields, then the Diederich-Fornæss index is 1.

Remark 3. It can also be seen that the same argument is valid on a Kähler manifold with some curvature constraint. For example, let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in a 2-dimensional complex manifold M and assume on a neighborhood of Ω in M , a Kähler metric with vanishing sectional curvature exists. Let Σ denote the set of Levi-flat points in $\partial\Omega$. Assume that Σ is a real curve and transversal to the holomorphic tangent vector of $\partial\Omega$. Then the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1. The condition of Kähler metric with vanishing sectional curvature might be replaced by the one of Kähler metric (see Section 2) satisfying

$$\nabla_L \nabla_N \nabla \rho - \nabla_N \nabla_L \nabla \rho - \nabla_{[L,N]} \nabla \rho = 0.$$

For the definition of Diederich-Fornæss index on a Kähler manifold, see (“On L^2 -estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ on a pseudoconvex domain” and its erratum on her homepage).

Moreover, Theorem 0.2 is a special case of the following theorem. Theorem 0.3 describes geometry of the Levi-flat sets by existence of solution to a type of partial differential equations.

Theorem 0.3. *Let δ be an arbitrarily defining function of a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with smooth boundary. Let $\Sigma \subset \partial\Omega$ denote the Levi-flat sets of $\partial\Omega$. Suppose there is a real function u which solves*

$$L(u) = -\frac{\text{Hess}_\delta(L, N)}{\|\nabla \delta\|}$$

on Σ . Then the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1.

In Section 5, we construct a specific bounded pseudoconvex domain $\tilde{\Omega}$ to attack Question 3. Finally, Theorem 5.2 gives a satisfaction answer.

Before we proceed to prove our theorems, we briefly mention some history here and from it, one can have a full picture of the other extreme cases in which the Diederich-Fornæss index is away from 1. In 1977, Diederich-Fornæss found a domain called the worm domain in (“Pseudoconvex domains: an example with nontrivial Nebenhülle”) which gives a non-trivial Diederich-Fornæss index (i.e., an index strictly between 0 and 1). In fact, they show that the Diederich-Fornæss exponent can be arbitrarily close to 0.

Definition 0.2. Let $\beta > \pi/2$ and $\eta : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a fixed smooth function with the following properties:

1. $\eta(x) \geq 0$, η is even and convex.
2. $\eta^{-1}(0) = I_{\beta-\pi/2} = [-\beta + \pi/2, \beta - \pi/2]$.
3. there exists and $a > 0$ such that $\eta(x) > 1$ if $x < -a$ or $x > a$.

4. $\eta'(x) \neq 0$ if $\eta(x) = 1$.

Then

$$\Omega_\beta = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z + e^{i \log |w|^2}|^2 < 1 - \eta^2(\log |w|)\}.$$

is called a β -worm domain.

In 1992, Barrett showed in (“Behavior of the Bergman projection on the Diederich-Fornæss worm”), that the Bergman projection P on Ω_β does not map the Sobolev space $W^k(\Omega_\beta)$ into $W^k(\Omega_\beta)$ when $k \geq \pi/(2\beta - \pi)$. In 2000, Berndtsson and Charpentier showed, in (“A Sobolev mapping property of the Bergman kernel”), that the Bergman projection P on Ω_β does map Sobolev space $W^k(\Omega_\beta)$ into $W^k(\Omega_\beta)$ when $k < \tau/2$ where τ is a Diederich-Fornæss exponent. As a consequence, the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω_β is less or equal to $2\pi/(2\beta - \pi)$. The reader can also deduce this result from Krantz and Peloso (“Analysis and geometry on worm domains”). Indeed, Theorem 6 in (“Pseudoconvex domains: an example with non-vanishing index”) says that if the standard defining function of Ω_β has exponent $\leq \eta$, then all other defining functions have exponent $\leq \eta$, that is, the Diederich-Fornæss index of $\Omega_\beta \leq \eta$. Thus, the calculation in (“Analysis and geometry on worm domains”) shows that the $\Omega_\beta \leq \pi/(2\beta - \pi)$. Recently Fu and Shaw and Adachi and Brinkschulte proved independently in (“The Diederich-Fornæss exponent and non-existence of a global estimate for the Diederich-Fornæss index of weakly pseudoconvex domains”) respectively that, roughly speaking, if a relatively compact domain in a complex manifold has all boundary points Levi-flat, then the Diederich-Fornæss index is non-trivial.

1 Preliminaries

We begin by fixing some basic notation. Let M be a Hermitian manifold with complex structure J and metric g . For a real tangent vector fields X we define

$$Z = \frac{1}{2}(X - \sqrt{-1}JX)$$

to be a holomorphic tangent vector field and

$$\bar{Z} = \frac{1}{2}(X + \sqrt{-1}JX)$$

to be an anti-holomorphic tangent vector field. Recall that, if f is a function defined on M , then

$$Zf = g(\nabla f, \bar{Z}) = g(Z, \nabla f).$$

We also define the Hessian of a function f on real tangent vector fields:

$$\text{Hess}_f(X, Y) = g(\nabla_X \nabla f, Y) = Y(Xf) - (\nabla_Y X)f,$$

and for holomorphic tangent vectors we calculate as follows:

$$\text{Hess}_f(Z, W) = g(\nabla_Z \nabla f, W) = Z(\bar{W}f) - \nabla_Z \bar{W}f = \overline{\text{Hess}_f(W, \bar{Z})}.$$

We can also write the gradient in complex notation. Namely,

$$\nabla f = 2 \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial w} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{w}} \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right).$$

If the sectional curvature of M vanishes, then we have that the curvature tensor vanishes which means

$$R_m(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4) \equiv 0,$$

where R_m denotes the curvature tensor. That means

$$0 \equiv \nabla_{Z_1} \nabla_{Z_2} Z_3 - \nabla_{Z_2} \nabla_{Z_1} Z_3 - \nabla_{[Z_1, Z_2]} Z_3,$$

for arbitrary holomorphic tangent fields Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 of M . For the basic notion of curvatures see (*Riemannian geometry*).

From now on, we work on a domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and discuss transversality. Recall that a tangent vector of $\mathbb{C}^2$

$$L = f_1(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + f_2(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} + g_1(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial w} + g_2(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}}$$

indeed defines two real tangent vectors:

$$2 \operatorname{Re} L := \operatorname{Re}(f_1 + f_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \operatorname{Im}(f_1 - f_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \operatorname{Re}(g_1 + g_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + \operatorname{Im}(g_1 - g_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$$

and

$$2 \operatorname{Im} L := \operatorname{Im}(f_1 + f_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \operatorname{Re}(f_2 - f_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \operatorname{Im}(g_1 + g_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + \operatorname{Re}(g_2 - g_1) \frac{\partial}{\partial v},$$

where we let the coordinate be

$$z = x + yi, \text{ and } w = u + vi.$$

Sometimes $\operatorname{Re} L$ and $\operatorname{Im} L$ are linearly dependent. But, for a nonzero holomorphic tangent vector

$$L = f(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + g(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial w},$$

$\operatorname{Re} L$ and $\operatorname{Im} L$ are always independent because of the following easy lemma.

Lemma 1.1. *Let*

$$V = f_1(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + f_2(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} + g_1(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial w} + g_2(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}},$$

be a complex vector field. If $\operatorname{Re} V$ and $\operatorname{Im} V$ are linearly dependent, then

$$|f_1| = |f_2| \quad \text{and} \quad |g_1| = |g_2|.$$

In particular, if $V = L$ is a holomorphic vector field with $\operatorname{Re} L$ and $\operatorname{Im} L$ linearly dependent, then $L = 0$.

Proof. Give that

$$V = f_1(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + f_2(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} + g_1(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial w} + g_2(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}},$$

and that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(f_1 + f_2) \\ \operatorname{Im}(f_1 - f_2) \\ \operatorname{Re}(g_1 + g_2) \\ \operatorname{Im}(g_1 - g_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Im}(f_1 + f_2) \\ \operatorname{Re}(f_2 - f_1) \\ \operatorname{Im}(g_1 + g_2) \\ \operatorname{Re}(g_2 - g_1) \end{pmatrix}$$

are linearly dependent. Hence, both of the following two determinants

$$\begin{vmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(f_1 + f_2) & \operatorname{Im}(f_1 + f_2) \\ \operatorname{Im}(f_1 - f_2) & \operatorname{Re}(f_2 - f_1) \end{vmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{vmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(g_1 + g_2) & \operatorname{Im}(g_1 + g_2) \\ \operatorname{Im}(g_1 - g_2) & \operatorname{Re}(g_2 - g_1) \end{vmatrix}$$

have to be zero.

By straightforward calculation,

$$\begin{vmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(f_1 + f_2) & \operatorname{Im}(f_1 + f_2) \\ \operatorname{Im}(f_1 - f_2) & \operatorname{Re}(f_2 - f_1) \end{vmatrix} = |\operatorname{Re} f_2|^2 - |\operatorname{Re} f_1|^2 - |\operatorname{Im} f_1|^2 + |\operatorname{Im} f_2|^2 = |f_2|^2 - |f_1|^2$$

and

$$\begin{vmatrix} \operatorname{Re}(g_1 + g_2) & \operatorname{Im}(g_1 + g_2) \\ \operatorname{Im}(g_1 - g_2) & \operatorname{Re}(g_2 - g_1) \end{vmatrix} = |\operatorname{Re} g_2|^2 - |\operatorname{Re} g_1|^2 - |\operatorname{Im} g_1|^2 + |\operatorname{Im} g_2|^2 = |g_2|^2 - |g_1|^2.$$

This immediately gives

$$|f_1| = |f_2| \quad \text{and} \quad |g_1| = |g_2|.$$

□

Lemma 1.1 guarantees that we are able to generalize the notion of *transversality* to nonzero holomorphic tangent vector fields, because $|f_2| = |g_2| = 0$.

Definition 1.1. We say that a real curve $\gamma(t)$ is *transversal* to a nonzero holomorphic tangent vector

$$L = f(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + g(z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$$

if $\gamma'(t)$, $\operatorname{Re} L$ and $\operatorname{Im} L$ are linear independent.

It is also easy to see that linear independence is preserved by a diffeomorphism.

2 Some Calculations

Let r be an arbitrary defining function of Ω . We want to modify the defining function in order to seek the best one for optimizing the Diederich-Fornæss exponent. Put $\rho = re^\psi$, where ψ will be determined later. We have the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined by a smooth defining function r . The vector field

$$L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z}|^2 + |\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w}|^2}} \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right)$$

on $\partial\Omega$ is called the *normalized holomorphic tangential vector field*, and

$$N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z}|^2 + |\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w}|^2}} \left(\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \bar{w}} \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right)$$

on $\partial\Omega$ is called the *normalized complex normal vector field*.

Note that, to the fact that L, N are unit vectors, $\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L) = \text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(N, N) = 1$. Also $\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, N) = 0$ due to the fact they are orthogonal. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Hess}_{-(-re^\psi)\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}}(aL + bN, aL + bN) \\
&= e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}(-re^\psi)^{\eta-1}(|a|^2((\delta^2\eta)(-re^\psi)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-re^\psi)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L) - e^\psi L(\psi)\overline{L}(r) \\
&\quad - e^\psi L(r)\overline{L}(\psi) - re^\psi L(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) - e^\psi \text{Hess}_r(L, L) - re^\psi \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L)) \\
&\quad + 2\text{Re}(a\overline{b}(\delta\eta e^\psi L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(r) + \delta\eta re^\psi L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\psi) + (\delta^2\eta)(-re^\psi)L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-re^\psi)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, N) \\
&\quad - e^\psi L(\psi)\overline{N}(r) - e^\psi L(r)\overline{N}(\psi) - re^\psi L(\psi)\overline{N}(\psi) - e^\psi \text{Hess}_r(L, N) - re^\psi \text{Hess}_\psi(L, N))) \\
&\quad + |b|^2(\delta\eta N(\rho)\overline{N}(|z|^2) + \delta\eta N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\rho) + (\delta^2\eta)(-\rho)N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-\rho)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(N, N) \\
&\quad - \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1}{-\rho}(\eta - 1)N(\rho)\overline{N}(\rho))) \\
&= -\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}(-re^\psi)^{\eta-1}(|a|^2 I + 2\text{Re}(a\overline{b} II) + |b|^2 III)
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $L(\rho) = \overline{L}(\rho) = 0$ and $\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L) = 1$. From these, we can simplify the term I a little bit in $\mathbb{C}^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= (\delta^2\eta)(-re^\psi)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-re^\psi)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L) - e^\psi L(\psi)\overline{L}(r) - e^\psi L(r)\overline{L}(\psi) \\
&\quad - re^\psi L(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) - e^\psi \text{Hess}_r(L, L) - re^\psi \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) \\
&= (\delta^2\eta)(-re^\psi)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-re^\psi)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L) - re^\psi L(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) \\
&\quad - e^\psi \text{Hess}_r(L, L) - re^\psi \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) \\
&= e^\psi((\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-r)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L) - rL(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) - \text{Hess}_r(L, L) \\
&\quad - r\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L)) \\
&= e^\psi((\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-r) - rL(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) - \text{Hess}_r(L, L) - r\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L)),
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, N) = 0$ we can further simplify II a little:

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \delta\eta e^\psi L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(r) + \delta\eta re^\psi L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\psi) + (\delta^2\eta)(-re^\psi)L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-re^\psi)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, N) \\
&\quad - e^\psi L(\psi)\overline{N}(r) - e^\psi L(r)\overline{N}(\psi) - re^\psi L(\psi)\overline{N}(\psi) - e^\psi \text{Hess}_r(L, N) - re^\psi \text{Hess}_\psi(L, N) \\
&= e^\psi(\delta\eta L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(r) + \delta\eta rL(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\psi) + (\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-r)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, N) \\
&\quad - L(\psi)\overline{N}(r) - L(r)\overline{N}(\psi) - rL(\psi)\overline{N}(\psi) - \text{Hess}_r(L, N) - r\text{Hess}_\psi(L, N)) \\
&= e^\psi(\delta\eta L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(r) + \delta\eta rL(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\psi) + (\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - L(\psi)\overline{N}(r) - L(r)\overline{N}(\psi) \\
&\quad - rL(\psi)\overline{N}(\psi) - \text{Hess}_r(L, N) - r\text{Hess}_\psi(L, N)).
\end{aligned}$$

More specifically, on $\partial\Omega$, we have an estimate.

$$|II| < e^\psi(\delta\eta|L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(r)| + |L(\psi)\overline{N}(r)| + |\text{Hess}_r(L, N)|).$$

Now, for *III*,

$$\begin{aligned}
III &= \delta\eta N(\rho)\overline{N}(|z|^2) + \delta\eta N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\rho) + (\delta^2\eta)(-\rho)N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-\rho)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(N, N) \\
&\quad - \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1}{-\rho}(\eta - 1)N(\rho)\overline{N}(\rho) \\
&= \delta\eta N(\rho)\overline{N}(|z|^2) + \delta\eta N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\rho) + (\delta^2\eta)(-\rho)N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-\rho)\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(N, N) \\
&\quad - \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1}{-re^\psi}(\eta - 1)(e^{2\psi}|N(r)|^2 + e^{2\psi}r^2|N(\psi)|^2 + re^{2\psi}N(r)\overline{N}(\psi) + re^{2\psi}N(\psi)\overline{N}(r)) \\
&= \delta\eta N(\rho)\overline{N}(|z|^2) + \delta\eta N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(\rho) + (\delta^2\eta)(-\rho)N(|z|^2)\overline{N}(|z|^2) - \delta(-\rho) - \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{-re^\psi}(\eta - 1)(e^{2\psi}|N(r)|^2 + e^{2\psi}r^2|N(\psi)|^2 + re^{2\psi}N(r)\overline{N}(\psi) + re^{2\psi}N(\psi)\overline{N}(r))
\end{aligned}$$

By the previous equality, after shrinking the neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ so that r is sufficiently small, we can also obtain an estimate for *III*:

$$III < \frac{e^\psi}{-2r}(\eta - 1)|N(r)|^2.$$

From the calculation above, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Ω, r, L and N be as above, and let ψ be a smooth function. Let $\eta, \delta > 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&H_{-(-re^\psi)\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}}(aL + bN, aL + bN) \\
&= -\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}(-re^\psi)^{\eta-1}(|a|^2I + 2\text{Re}(a\bar{b}II) + |b|^2III),
\end{aligned}$$

where, on a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= e^\psi \left((\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-r) - rL(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) - \text{Hess}_r(L, L) - r\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) \right), \\
III &< \frac{e^\psi}{2(-r)}(\eta - 1)|N(r)|^2
\end{aligned}$$

and on $\partial\Omega$, we have the estimate

$$|II| < e^\psi \left(\delta\eta|L(|z|^2)\overline{N}(r)| + |L(\psi)\overline{N}(r)| + |\text{Hess}_r(L, N)| \right).$$

3 Calculation of the D-F Index

In this section, we prove Theorem 0.1. We also want to point out that Behrens's counterexample that we mentioned in Section 0 will not contradict the converse of Theorem 0.1. This is because her example has only one Levi-flat point on the boundary and we will show more generally that, if the Levi-flat points form a real curve (see Theorem 0.2), then it satisfies the condition of Theorem 0.1.

We define ψ to be $-C|\text{Hess}_r(L_r, N_r)|^2$, where $C > 0$ is some number to be determined and

$$L_r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{z}}|^2 + |\frac{\partial r}{\partial w}|^2}} \left(\frac{\partial r}{\partial w} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} - \frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right)$$

and

$$N_r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{z}}|^2 + |\frac{\partial r}{\partial w}|^2}} \left(\frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} + \frac{\partial r}{\partial \bar{w}} \frac{\partial}{\partial w} \right).$$

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that*

$$\text{Hess}_r(L, N) = 0,$$

on Σ , where Σ is a subset of $\partial\Omega$. Let

$$\psi = -C|\text{Hess}_r(L_r, N_r)|^2$$

for arbitrary $C > 0$. Then

$$L_r(\psi) = 0, \tag{1}$$

and

$$\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) = \text{Hess}_\psi(L_r, L_r) \leq -C|L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r)|^2 = -C|N_r \text{Hess}_r(L_r, L_r)|^2 \tag{2}$$

on Σ .

Proof. We first prove (1). Let $\xi = \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r)$ and then $\psi = -C\xi\bar{\xi}$. We observe that

$$L_r(\psi) = -CL_r(\xi\bar{\xi}) = -C\xi L_r(\bar{\xi}) - C\bar{\xi} L_r(\xi).$$

The preceding equation is 0 because

$$\xi = \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) = 0 = \text{Hess}_r(L_r, N_r) = \bar{\xi}$$

on Σ .

Now we are going to prove (2). Observe that on $\partial\Omega$, $L = L_r$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_{\xi\bar{\xi}}(L_r, L_r) &= g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla(\xi\bar{\xi}), L_r) = g(\nabla_{L_r}(\xi \nabla \bar{\xi}), L_r) + g(\nabla_{L_r}(\bar{\xi} \nabla \xi), L_r) \\ &= 2\text{Re}(\xi \text{Hess}_{\bar{\xi}}(L_r, L_r)) + |L_r \xi|^2 + |L_r \bar{\xi}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) = \text{Hess}_\psi(L_r, L_r) \leq -C|L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r)|^2$$

because $\xi = 0$ on Σ . Next, we prove

$$L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) = N_r \text{Hess}_r(L_r, L_r)$$

on Σ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) &= L_r g(\nabla_{N_r} \nabla r, L_r) \\ &= g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla_{N_r} \nabla r, L_r) + g(\nabla_{N_r} \nabla r, \nabla_{\bar{L}_r} L_r) \\ &= g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla_{N_r} \nabla r, L_r) + \text{Hess}_r(N_r, \nabla_{\bar{L}_r} L_r). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\text{Hess}_r(L_r, N_r) = \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) = 0$$

and

$$0 = \text{Hess}_r(L_r, L_r) = L_r(\bar{L}_r r) - (\nabla_{L_r} \bar{L}_r) r = -(\nabla_{L_r} \bar{L}_r) r,$$

we have that $\nabla_{\bar{L}_r} L_r$ is proportional to L_r and $\text{Hess}_r(N_r, \nabla_{\bar{L}_r} L_r) = 0$. Hence

$$L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) = g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla_{N_r} \nabla r, L_r) = g(\nabla_{N_r} \nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, L_r) + g(\nabla_{[L_r, N_r]} \nabla r, L_r),$$

because of the vanishing of the sectional curvature of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L) &= g(\nabla_{N_r} \nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, L_r) + g(\nabla_{[L_r, N_r]} \nabla r, L_r) \\ &= g(\nabla_{N_r} \nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, L_r) + \overline{g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, [L_r, N_r])} \\ &= N_r g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, L_r) - g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, \nabla_{\bar{N}_r} L_r) + \overline{g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, [L_r, N_r])}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second term vanishes because

$$0 = \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) = N_r(\overline{L}_r r) - (\nabla_{N_r} \overline{L}_r) r = -(\nabla_{N_r} \overline{L}_r) r$$

implies that $\nabla_{\overline{N}_r} L_r$ is proportional to L_r and the third term vanishes because $[L_r, N_r]$ is linearly spanned by L_r and N_r and $g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, L_r) = g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, N_r) = 0$. Thus

$$L_r \text{Hess}_r(N_r, L_r) = N_r g(\nabla_{L_r} \nabla r, L_r) = N \text{Hess}_r(L_r, L_r),$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4. From the preceding lemma, we can also see that on Σ

$$L(\psi) = 0,$$

and

$$\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) \leq -C|L \text{Hess}_r(N, L)|^2 = -C|N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|^2$$

because on $\partial\Omega$, L, N coincide with L_r, N_r .

Then, with the notation of Lemma 2.1, we have on Σ ,

$$|II| < e^\psi (\delta\eta |L(|z|^2) \overline{N}(r)|).$$

Moreover, there must be a neighborhood Σ_ϵ , which is dependent on $\epsilon > 0$, of Σ in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and on the neighborhood, we have

$$|II| < e^\psi (3\delta\eta \max\{L(|z|^2), \epsilon\} |\overline{N}(r)|)$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$.

We can now prove Theorem 0.1. Our argument is similar to that of Fornaess and Gallagher in (“A note on plurisubharmonic defining functions in $\mathbb{C}^2$ ”).

Proof of Theorem 0.1. Firstly, we claim that if the Levi-form is bounded below by a positive number $\alpha > 0$, then in a neighborhood of these boundary points in $\mathbb{C}^2$

$$\text{Hess}_{-(-\rho)^\eta}(aL + bN, aL + bN) > 0$$

holds for any defining function ρ of Ω and any $0 < \eta < 1$. We are going to show this fact in the following paragraph.

It is enough to show that the complex Hessian of $-(-\rho)^\eta$ is positive definite in a neighborhood of the strongly pseudoconvex boundary points. Rewrite the complex Hessian of $-(-\rho)^\eta$ with matrices.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hess}_{-(-\rho)^\eta} &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_{-(-\rho)^\eta}(L_\rho, L_\rho) & \text{Hess}_{-(-\rho)^\eta}(L_\rho, N_\rho) \\ \text{Hess}_{-(-\rho)^\eta}(N_\rho, L_\rho) & \text{Hess}_{-(-\rho)^\eta}(N_\rho, N_\rho) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \eta(-\rho)^{\eta-1} \text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) & \eta(-\rho)^{\eta-1} \text{Hess}_\rho(L, N) \\ \eta(-\rho)^{\eta-1} \text{Hess}_\rho(N, L) & \eta(-\rho)^{\eta-1} \left(\text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho} |N\rho|^2 \right) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \eta(-\rho)^{\eta-1} \begin{pmatrix} \text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) & \text{Hess}_\rho(L, N) \\ \text{Hess}_\rho(N, L) & \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho} |N\rho|^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

is positive definite if and only if $\text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{vmatrix} \text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) & \text{Hess}_\rho(L, N) \\ \text{Hess}_\rho(N, L) & \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho}|N\rho|^2 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= \text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) \left(\text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho}|N\rho|^2 \right) - |\text{Hess}_\rho(L, N)|^2 \\ &= \text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) + \text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho}|N\rho|^2 - |\text{Hess}_\rho(L, N)|^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

But this is clear because of $\text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}$ and

$$\text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho}|N\rho|^2 \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{1-\eta}{-\rho}|N\rho|^2$$

in a neighborhood of strongly pseudoconvex boundary points. Indeed, the term $\frac{1-\eta}{-\rho}|N\rho|^2$ can approach $+\infty$ as ρ goes to 0, while

$$\text{Hess}_\rho(L, L) \text{Hess}_\rho(N, N) - |\text{Hess}_\rho(L, N)|^2$$

has to be bounded which completes the proof of the fact.

This implies that

$$\text{Hess}_{-(-re^\psi)\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}}(aL + bN, aL + bN) > 0.$$

So we just need to prove that

$$\text{Hess}_{-(-re^\psi)\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}}(aL + bN, aL + bN) > 0$$

on a neighborhood of the Levi-flat points in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Let Σ be the Levi-flat subsets of $\partial\Omega$. We learned in Lemma 2.1 that there exists a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that, on this neighborhood,

$$III < \frac{e^\psi}{-2r}(\eta - 1)|N(r)|^2.$$

To prove

$$\text{Hess}_{-(-re^\psi)\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}}(aL + bN, aL + bN) > 0$$

on a neighborhood of Σ for an appropriate δ , for all $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and all $0 < \eta < 1$, we need to show that

$$I + III < -2|II|$$

on a neighborhood of Σ in $\mathbb{C}^2$. We have seen on the neighborhood Σ_ϵ of Σ in $\mathbb{C}^2$,

$$III < \frac{e^\psi}{-2r}(\eta - 1)|N(r)|^2$$

and

$$|II| < e^\psi(3\delta\eta \max\{L(|z|^2), \epsilon\}|\overline{N}(r)|).$$

If we can show that, on a neighborhood of Σ in $\mathbb{C}^2$,

$$I < -\frac{e^\psi}{4}\delta(-r),$$

then we are able to see that

$$\text{Hess}_{-(re^\psi)\eta e^{-\delta\eta|z|^2}}(aL + bN, aL + bN) > 0.$$

This is because, after shrinking δ further,

$$-\frac{1}{4}\delta(-r) - \frac{1-\eta}{-2r}|N(r)|^2 < -|N(r)|\frac{\sqrt{1-\eta}}{2}\sqrt{\delta} < -6\delta\eta \max\{L(|z|^2), \epsilon\}|\overline{N}(r)| \quad (3)$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Thus, if we can show that, on a neighborhood of Σ ,

$$(\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) - \delta(-r) - rL(\psi)\overline{L}(\psi) - \text{Hess}_r(L, L) - r\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) < -\frac{1}{4}\delta(-r),$$

then we are done.

Indeed, after shrinking δ , we do not need to consider $(\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2)$ because it is $o(\delta^2)$ and we can control it to make

$$(\delta^2\eta)(-r)L(|z|^2)\overline{L}(|z|^2) = (\delta^2\eta)(-r)|L(|z|^2)|^2 < \frac{1}{2}\delta(-r).$$

Hence we just need to show that

$$-r(q)L(\psi)|_q\overline{L}(\psi)|_q - \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_q - r(q)\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L)|_q < \frac{1}{4}\delta(-r(q))\text{Hess}_{|z|^2}(L, L)|_q$$

for $q \in \Omega$. And thus it is enough to show that

$$-r(q)L(\psi)|_q\overline{L}(\psi)|_q - \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_q + \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_p - r(q)\text{Hess}_\psi(L, L)|_q < \frac{1}{4}\delta(-r(q))$$

for q in some neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $p \in \partial\Omega$ so that $\text{dist}(q, p) = \text{dist}(q, \partial\Omega)$, because of $\text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_p \geq 0$.

Thus it is enough to show that

$$L(\psi)|_q\overline{L}(\psi)|_q - \lim_{q \rightarrow p} \frac{\text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_q - \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_p}{-r(q) + r(p)} + \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L)|_p < \frac{1}{5}\delta$$

on a neighborhood of Σ in $\partial\Omega$ where the limit means that q approaches p along the shortest path.

But here

$$\begin{aligned} -\lim_{q \rightarrow p} \frac{\text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_q - \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|_p}{-r(q) + r(p)} &= \frac{g(\nabla \text{Hess}_r(L, L), N + \overline{N})}{g(\nabla r, N + \overline{N})} = \frac{2\text{Re}(N \text{Hess}_r(L, L))}{\|\nabla r\|} \\ &\leq \mathcal{K} \text{Re}(N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\mathcal{K} > 0$.

It is enough to show that

$$\mathcal{K}|N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)| + \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) < \frac{1}{8}\delta$$

on Σ because we can find a neighborhood of Σ in $\partial\Omega$ so that

$$L(\psi)|_q\overline{L}(\psi)|_q = |L(\psi)|_q|^2 < \frac{1}{80}\delta$$

by a continuity argument.

We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}|N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)| + \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) &\leq \mathcal{K}|N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)| - C|N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)|^2 \\ &< \frac{\mathcal{K}^2}{4C}, \end{aligned}$$

and we take C so that

$$\frac{\mathcal{K}^2}{4C} \leq \frac{1}{8}\delta.$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{K}|N \text{Hess}_r(L, L)| + \text{Hess}_\psi(L, L) < \frac{1}{8}\delta,$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

4 Complex Transport Equations

In this section, we are going to imitate transport equations in the real sense to the complex sense. It is well known that differential equations are very different in the real and complex contents. Thus, the imitation of transport equation in the complex sense cannot be fully extended.

In this section, our aim is to show that, if L is a holomorphic (anti-holomorphic) tangent vector field and h is a smooth complex-valued function, the equation

$$Lu = h$$

is always solvable for real u . We prove the following lemma.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary and Γ be a compact (real) smooth curve parametrized by $\gamma : [0, r] \rightarrow \Gamma$. (Here $\gamma(0) = \gamma(r)$ or $\gamma(0) \neq \gamma(r)$.) Let h be a complex-valued smooth function defined on a neighborhood of Γ in $\partial\Omega$. Then, the following equation*

$$Lu = h, \quad \text{on } \Gamma \tag{4}$$

has a real solution, where u is real-valued smooth function defined in the neighborhood of Γ .

Proof. Assume Γ is parametrized by $\Gamma = \gamma([0, r])$. We can extend Γ smoothly beyond its endpoints if it is not a closed curve in order to give a neighborhood of endpoints to study. In case of a non-closed curve, redefine $\gamma : [-\epsilon, r + \epsilon] \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ and still assume that γ is a smooth real curve and γ' , $\text{Re } L$ and $\text{Im } L$ are independent. (This is feasible if $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough.) We prove (4). Let $p \in \Gamma$. We find a neighborhood U_p of p and assume $\phi_p : U_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is a diffeomorphism. Then we have in the coordinates, the holomorphic tangent vector

$$L = f_1(z, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + f_2(z, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} + g(z, t) \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$$

on the neighborhood. This gives two vectors $\text{Re } L$ and $\text{Im } L$. Possibly after shrinking U_p , we can always assume that $\phi_p \circ \gamma(t) = (0, 0, t)$ and $\phi_p(\Gamma)$ is contained in the t -axis of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We first consider the following equation which admits smooth real solution

$$(x(s_1, s_2, s_3), y(s_1, s_2, s_3), t(s_1, s_2, s_3)) :$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_1} = \operatorname{Re}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial s_1} = \operatorname{Im}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) - f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \\ \frac{\partial t}{\partial s_1} = \operatorname{Re} g(0, 0, s_3), \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_2} = \operatorname{Im}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial s_2} = \operatorname{Re}(f_2(0, 0, s_3) - f_1(0, 0, s_3)) \\ \frac{\partial t}{\partial s_2} = \operatorname{Im} g(0, 0, s_3) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and $(x(s_1, s_2, s_3), y(s_1, s_2, s_3), t(s_1, s_2, s_3))$ also satisfies the initial conditions:

$$(x(0, 0, s_3), y(0, 0, s_3), t(0, 0, s_3)) = \phi_p \circ \gamma(s_3) = (0, 0, s_3).$$

To solve (5) and (6) in $\phi_p(U_p) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, we let

$$x(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \operatorname{Re}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3))s_1 + \operatorname{Im}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3))s_2,$$

$$y(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \operatorname{Im}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) - f_2(0, 0, s_3))s_1 + \operatorname{Re}(f_2(0, 0, s_3) - f_1(0, 0, s_3))s_2$$

and

$$t(s_1, s_2, s_3) = s_3 + (\operatorname{Re} g(0, 0, s_3))s_1 + (\operatorname{Im} g(0, 0, s_3))s_2.$$

We check also the initial condition $(x(0, 0, s_3), y(0, 0, s_3)) = (0, 0)$ and $t(0, 0, s_3) = s_3$. Hence

$$(x(0, 0, s_3), y(0, 0, s_3), t(0, 0, s_3)) = (0, 0, s_3).$$

Without loss of generality, we consider $x(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ solving

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_1} = \operatorname{Re}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \\ \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_2} = \operatorname{Im}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with initial condition $x(0, 0, s_3) = 0$. It is clear that the solution is unique. Hence it can be extended to the whole curve $\gamma([0, r])$ uniquely.

We are going to check the condition of the inverse function theorem on the map

$$(x(s_1, s_2, s_3), y(s_1, s_2, s_3), t(s_1, s_2, s_3))$$

at $(0, 0, s_3)$. Now

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_1} & \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_2} & \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_3} \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial s_1} & \frac{\partial y}{\partial s_2} & \frac{\partial y}{\partial s_3} \\ \frac{\partial t}{\partial s_1} & \frac{\partial t}{\partial s_2} & \frac{\partial t}{\partial s_3} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank 3 because $\gamma'(s_3)$, $\operatorname{Re} L$ and $\operatorname{Im} L$ are linearly independent. Hence locally we can define

$$h(s_1, s_2, s_3) := h(x(s_1, s_2, s_3), y(s_1, s_2, s_3), t(s_1, s_2, s_3)).$$

Thus, we define

$$u(s_1, s_2, s_3) = h_1(0, 0, s_3)s_1 + h_2(0, 0, s_3)s_2.$$

We immediately find that

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s_1} = h_1(0, 0, s_3)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s_2} = h_2(0, 0, s_3)$$

can be solved uniquely by

$$u = h_1(0, 0, s_3)s_1 + h_2(0, 0, s_3)s_2$$

given with the initial condition

$$u(0, 0, s_3) = 0.$$

Since

$$\operatorname{Re} L = \operatorname{Re}(f_1 + f_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \operatorname{Im}(f_1 - f_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \operatorname{Re} g \frac{\partial}{\partial t},$$

on Γ locally it can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} L &= \operatorname{Re}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) + f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \operatorname{Im}(f_1(0, 0, s_3) - f_2(0, 0, s_3)) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \operatorname{Re} g(0, 0, s_3) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \\ &= \frac{\partial x}{\partial s_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial y}{\partial s_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t}{\partial s_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial s_1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the same reason

$$\operatorname{Im} L = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_2}.$$

One can see again that u solves

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s_1} = h_1$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial s_2} = h_2$$

with initial condition $u(0, 0, s_3) = 0$ uniquely. By the inverse function theorem, we can find $u(x, y, t)$ solving $Lu = h$ on Γ and such a u is defined on a neighborhood of Γ .

□

The following extension lemma is classical. One can find it in any book on smooth manifolds, e.g. Lemma 2.26 of (*Introduction to smooth manifolds*).

Lemma 4.1 (Extension Lemma for Smooth Functions). *Suppose that M is a smooth manifold with or without boundary, $A \subset M$ is a closed subset, and $f : A \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. For any open subset U containing A , there exists a smooth function $\tilde{f} : M \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{f}|_A = f$ and $\operatorname{supp} \tilde{f} \subset U$.*

Proof of Theorem 0.2. Calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Hess}_{\delta e^\phi}(L, N) &= g(\nabla_L \nabla(\delta e^\phi), N) \\ &= g(\nabla_L(\delta \nabla e^\phi), N) + g(\nabla_L(e^\phi \nabla \delta), N) \\ &= \delta g(\nabla_L(\nabla e^\phi), N) + e^\phi L(\delta) \overline{N}(\phi) + e^\phi g(\nabla_L(\nabla \delta), N) + e^\phi L(\phi) \overline{N}(\delta) \end{aligned}$$

On $\partial\Omega$,

$$\operatorname{Hess}_{\delta e^\phi}(L, N) = e^\phi g(\nabla_L(\nabla \delta), N) + e^\phi L(\phi) \overline{N}(\delta) = e^\phi (\operatorname{Hess}_\delta(L, N) + L(\phi) \overline{N}(\delta)).$$

We let ϕ be the solution of

$$\overline{L}(\phi) = -\frac{\overline{\operatorname{Hess}_\delta(L, N)}}{N(\delta)},$$

from Proposition 4.1 defined on a closed neighborhood $\overline{V}$ of Γ in $\partial\Omega$. Then one finds on Γ that

$$\text{Hess}_{\delta e^\phi}(L, N) = 0.$$

By the extension lemma for smooth functions, we can find $\tilde{\phi}$ defined on a neighborhood U of Γ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $\tilde{\phi}|_{\overline{V}} = \phi$. We find a smooth function χ defined on a neighborhood of Ω and $\text{supp } \tilde{\phi} \subset W$ where W is an open subset of $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that $\Gamma \subset \overline{W} \subset U$. Now χ also satisfies

$$\chi(z, w) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (z, w) \in W \\ 0, & \text{if } (z, w) \notin U. \end{cases}$$

Then we define Φ to be

$$\Phi(z, w) = \begin{cases} \chi \tilde{\phi}, & \text{if } (z, w) \in U \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then δe^Φ is a defining function of Ω which satisfies

$$\text{Hess}_{\delta e^\Phi}(L, N) = 0$$

on Γ . By Theorem 0.1, the theorem is proved. $\square$

Inspired by the preceding proof, the following theorem can be established.

Theorem 4.1. *Let δ be an arbitrarily defining function of a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with smooth boundary. Let $\Sigma \subset \partial\Omega$ denote the Levi-flat sets of $\partial\Omega$. Then*

$$\text{Hess}_\rho(L, N) = 0$$

on Σ for the defining function $\rho = \delta e^\phi$ of Ω if and only if there exists a (real) smooth function ϕ so that

$$L(\phi) = -\frac{\text{Hess}_\delta(L, N)}{\overline{N}(\delta)} \quad \text{on } \Sigma,$$

where L is the normalized holomorphic tangential vector field of $\partial\Omega$ and N is the normalized holomorphic normal vector field of $\partial\Omega$. Specially, if there is no real function ϕ which solves

$$L(\phi) = -\frac{\text{Hess}_\delta(L, N)}{\overline{N}(\delta)},$$

then there exists no defining functions r so that $\text{Hess}_r(L, N) = 0$.

Proof. The first part is true because of the equality:

$$\text{Hess}_{\delta e^\phi}(L, N) = e^\phi(\text{Hess}_\delta(L, N) + L(\phi)\overline{N}(\delta)) \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

The second part holds because it is well known that every defining function ρ can be written as $\rho = \delta \cdot h$ for some smooth $h > 0$. We define $\phi = \log h$ and then the second part follows from the first part. $\square$

From the preceding theorem, combining with Theorem 0.1 we have the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let δ be an arbitrarily defining function of a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with smooth boundary. Let $\Sigma \subset \partial\Omega$ denote the Levi-flat sets of $\partial\Omega$. Suppose there is a real function u which solves*

$$L(u) = -\frac{\text{Hess}_\delta(L, N)}{\|\nabla \delta\|}$$

on Σ . Then the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1.

5 Infinite Type and Diederich-Fornæss Index

It has been known to the experts that there is no equivalence between finite type and trivial Diederich-Fornæss index. Nevertheless, one can show that the domain of finite type has Diederich-Fornæss index 1. (Indeed, we could not find a precise reference. Professor Anne-Katrin Gallagher was kind to teach us the following arguments, so the authors owe her the credit.) This is done similar to the usual construction: $re^{-\phi_M}$ where r is some defining function for the domain, $\{\phi_M\}$ are the functions constructed by Catlin in (“Subelliptic estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains”). That is $0 \leq \phi_M \leq 1$ and the complex Hessian of ϕ_M in a direction ξ is larger than $M|\xi|^2$.

Let us consider a domain of which the Levi-flat points form a real curve transversal to the holomorphic tangent vector fields on the boundary. The reader should be warned that the following domain also admits a defining function which is plurisubharmonic on the boundary.

Example 5.1. Let

$$\Omega = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z|^2 + 2e^{-1/|w|^2} < 1\}$$

be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Moreover, it has an infinite type point at $(1, 0)$.

We are going to verify the Levi-flat points are only at $(e^{i\theta}, 0)$ for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Since

$$\rho(z, w) = |z|^2 + 2e^{-1/|w|^2} - 1,$$

we obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w} &= 2 \frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{w^2 \bar{w}}, \\ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z} &= \bar{z}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z \partial \bar{z}} &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial w \partial \bar{w}} = 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right).$$

Moreover, the holomorphic tangent vector field is

$$L = 2 \frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{w^2 \bar{w}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - \bar{z} \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$$

and its complex Hessian is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus the Levi form is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(2 \frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{w^2 \bar{w}} \quad -\bar{z} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{w \bar{w}^2} \\ -z \end{pmatrix} \\ &= 4 \frac{e^{-2/|w|^2}}{|w|^6} + 2|z|^2 e^{-1/|w|^2} \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right) \\ &= 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \left(2 \frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{|w|^6} + |z|^2 \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can see that

$$\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z| = 1, w = 0\}$$

is a set of Levi-flat points. To see if all Levi-flat points belong to it, we need to solve the algebraic equation:

$$\begin{cases} 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \left(2\frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{|w|^6} + |z|^2 \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right) \right) = 0 \\ |z|^2 + 2e^{-1/|w|^2} = 1. \end{cases}$$

In case $w \neq 0$, the previous equation is equivalent to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 2\frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{|w|^6} + \left(1 - 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|w|^6} - \frac{1}{|w|^4} + 2\frac{e^{-1/|w|^2}}{|w|^4} \\ &= \frac{1}{|w|^4} \left(\frac{1}{|w|^2} - 1 + 2e^{-1/|w|^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To solve

$$0 = \frac{1}{|w|^2} - 1 + 2e^{-1/|w|^2},$$

we let $t = -\frac{1}{|w|^2} < 0$ and it converts to

$$0 = -t - 1 + 2e^t$$

which asserts that $t < 0$ has no solution. Thus the complete Levi-flat set is

$$\Gamma := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z| = 1, w = 0\}.$$

The tangent vector on Γ is

$$x\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + y\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + 0\frac{\partial}{\partial u} + 0\frac{\partial}{\partial y},$$

where $z = x + iy$ and $w = u + iv$. At Γ ,

$$L = -\bar{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial w}.$$

Hence the Diederich-Fornæss index of Ω is 1, because of L is transversal to Γ . The same computation works for a slightly more general domain as what follows.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $p = (z_0, v_0)$ and*

$$\Omega_{a,b}(p) := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : a|z - z_0|^2 + 2e^{-1/|w-v_0|^2} < b\}$$

for arbitrary $a > 0$ and $b \in (0, 2)$. Then the Levi-flat sets $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(p)$ is

$$\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z - z_0| = \sqrt{\frac{b}{a}}, w = v_0\},$$

is a real curve and is transversal to holomorphic tangent vector fields. Hence, the Diederich-Fornæss index of $\Omega_{a,b}(p)$ is 1.

Remark 5. Let $z = x + iy$ and $w = u + iv$ and think v -axis as the vertical direction. By calculation, we find out the north pole $\mathcal{N}$ of $\Omega_{a,b}(p)$ is at $\left(0, v_0 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ln 2 - \ln b}}\right)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(p)$ is the equator. We also define $\Omega_{a,b}^+(p)$ to be $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{N}, \epsilon) \cap \Omega_{a,b}(p)$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen to be very small so that $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}(p) \cap \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{N}, 2\epsilon) = \emptyset$. We denote the complement of $\Omega_{a,b}^+(p)$ by $\Omega_{a,b}^-(p)$.

The previous example admits a defining function plurisubharmonic on the boundary. For the following paragraphs, we are going to construct a bounded pseudoconvex, infinite type domain $\tilde{\Omega}$ with smooth boundary which does not admit a defining function which is plurisubharmonic on the boundary. Our example is motivated by the method McNeal uses to prove Proposition 2.1 of (“Lower bounds on the Bergman metric near a point of finite type”). More specifically, we will solder one piece of the domain in (“Plurisubharmonic defining functions of weakly pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ ”) with our domain $\Omega_{a,b}$ along the strongly pseudoconvex boundary points. The result domain should be infinite type because of $\Omega_{a,b}$ and does not admit a defining function which is plurisubharmonic on the boundary because of Behrens’ result. Moreover, the domain has Diederich-Fornæss index 1 by Remark 2 following Corollary 0.1 because the Levi-flat points are a point united with a real curve transversal to holomorphic tangent vector fields.

Firstly, recall the result of (ibid.).

Theorem 5.1 (Behrens). *There is a $\tau_0 > 0$ such that $H \cap \mathbb{B}(0, \tau_0)$ is pseudoconvex from the side $\rho < 0$ and the origin is the only non-strongly pseudoconvex point, where H is a smooth hypersurface defined by the function*

$$\rho_H(z, w) = v + R(z, w),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_6(z) &= \frac{1}{2}|z|^6 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(-\frac{1}{20} \bar{z}^5 z + \frac{i}{4} \bar{z}^4 z^2 \right) \\ Q_4(z) &= \frac{1}{2}|z|^4 - \frac{i}{6} z^3 \bar{z} + \frac{i}{6} \bar{z}^3 z \\ R(z, w) &= P_6(z) + 2uQ_4(z) + |z|^2 u^2 + |z|^2 u^4 + |z|^{10} + |z|^6 u^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $p = (z_0, v_0)$, and we define

$$T(p, (z, w)) = a|z - z_0|^2 + 2e^{-1/|w - v_0|^2}$$

for $a > 0$.

Let $a > 0$ big, $0 < \delta < 1$ small, p in the side of $\rho_H < 0$ so that $\partial\Omega_{a,1}(p)$ intersects H transversally, $H \cap \partial\Omega_{a,1}(p) \subset \mathbb{B}(0, \tau_0)$ and $\Omega_{a,b}^-(p) \subset \{\rho_H < -\delta\}$. By continuity argument, we can also assume there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ so that $H \cap \partial\Omega_{a,1+\epsilon_0}(p) \subset \mathbb{B}(0, \tau_0)$ and H intersects $\partial\Omega_{a,b}(p)$ transversally for any $b \in (1 - \epsilon_0, 1 + \epsilon_0)$.

We define for a fixed $\eta \in (0, 1)$

$$\rho = K\chi_1(T(p, (z, w))) + \chi_2(-(-\rho_H(z, w))^\eta),$$

where $K > 2$ is to be determined later. Note it here that $-(-\rho_H(z, w))^\eta$ is plurisubharmonic for any $\eta > 0$ in $\rho_H < 0$ away from origin. This is because origin is the only non-strongly pseudoconvex point. Here we let $\chi_1(t)$ be a real-valued, C^∞ increasing function on $\mathbb{R}$ with $\chi_1(t) \equiv 0$ if $t < 1 - \epsilon_0$ for an $0 < \epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\chi_1''(t) > 0$ if $t > 1 - \epsilon_0$ and there is $t_0 \in (1 - \epsilon_0, 1 + \epsilon_0)$ so that $\chi_1(t_0) = t_0$. We also let $\chi_2(t) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^∞ increasing function such that $\chi_2(t) \equiv -\delta^\eta$ if $t \leq -(\delta^\eta)$ and $\chi_2(t) = t$ if $t > -\frac{1}{2}\delta^\eta$.

Let

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \rho(z, w) < 0\},$$

where K is big enough to ensure $\tilde{\Omega}$ being bounded. We divide $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$ into three sets:

$$B_1 = \{(z, w) \in \partial\tilde{\Omega} : T(p, (z, w)) < 1 - \epsilon_0\}$$

$$B_2 = \{(z, w) \in \partial\tilde{\Omega} : \rho_H(z, w) < -\delta\}$$

$$B_3 = \{(z, w) \in \partial\tilde{\Omega} : T(p, (z, w)) \geq 1 - \epsilon_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_H(z, w) > -\delta\}$$

For B_1 , $\chi_1 = 0$ so the $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$ is defined by ρ_H . For B_2 , observe that if $T(p, (z, w)) = 1 - \epsilon_0$,

$$\rho = -\delta^\eta < 0.$$

When $(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is such that $T(p, (z, w)) = t_0 \in (1 - \epsilon_0, 1 + \epsilon_0)$,

$$\rho = KT(p, (z, w)) - \delta^\eta > 2 - 2\epsilon_0 - \delta^\eta > 0,$$

by shrinking $\delta > 0$. Hence B_2 is defined by

$$a|z - z_0|^2 + 2e^{-1/|w - w_0|^2} = \chi_1^{-1}\left(\frac{\delta^\eta}{K}\right) < 2.$$

Moreover Levi-flat sets of B_2 is a real curve transversal to holomorphic tangent vector fields. For B_3 , ρ is a plurisubharmonic function, because $T(p, (z, w))$ and $-(-\rho_H)^\eta$ are both plurisubharmonic, for any η . So $\tilde{\Omega}$ is strongly pseudoconvex on B_3 . Since

$$\nabla \rho = K\chi'_1 \nabla T(p, (z, w)) + \chi'_2 (\eta(-\rho_H(z, w))^{\eta-1}) \nabla \rho_H,$$

and H intersects $\partial\Omega_{a,b}(p)$ transversally for any $b \in (1 - \epsilon_0, 1 + \epsilon_0)$, $\nabla \rho$ is not vanishing.

Hence, we obtain the main theorem in the current section.

Theorem 5.2. *$\tilde{\Omega}$ is a bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with smooth boundary which satisfies the following two properties*

1. *$\tilde{\Omega}$ is neither a domain of finite type nor a domain admitting a defining function which is plurisubharmonic on the boundary.*
2. *The Diederich-Fornæss index of $\tilde{\Omega}$ is 1.*

Acknowledgments. The authors thank to Dr. Bun Wong, Dr. Qi S. Zhang, Xinghong Pan, Dr. Lihan Wang for fruitful conversations. We also appreciate all kind help we received from Professor Anne-Katrin Gallagher.

References

- Diederich, Klas and John Erik Fornaess (1977). “Pseudoconvex domains: bounded strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions”. In: *Invent. Math.* 39.2, pp. 129–141. ISSN: 0020-9910.
- Kerzman, Norberto and Jean-Pierre Rosay (1981). “Fonctions plurisousharmoniques d’exhaustion bornées et domaines taut”. In: *Math. Ann.* 257.2, pp. 171–184. ISSN: 0025-5831. DOI: 10.1007/BF01458282.

- Demailly, Jean-Pierre (1987). “Mesures de Monge-Ampère et mesures pluriharmoniques”. In: *Math. Z.* 194.4, pp. 519–564. ISSN: 0025-5874. DOI: 10.1007/BF01161920.
- Harrington, Phillip S. (2008). “The order of plurisubharmonicity on pseudoconvex domains with Lipschitz boundaries”. In: *Math. Res. Lett.* 15.3, pp. 485–490. ISSN: 1073-2780. DOI: 10.4310/MRL.2008.v15.n3.a8.
- Harrington, Phillip S. (Oct. 2015). “Bounded Plurisubharmonic Exhaustion Functions for Lipschitz Pseudoconvex Domains in $\mathbb{CP}^n$ ”. In: *ArXiv e-prints*.
- Straube, Emil J. (2010). *Lectures on the L^2 -Sobolev theory of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem*. ESI Lectures in Mathematics and Physics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, pp. viii+206. ISBN: 978-3-03719-076-0. DOI: 10.4171/076.
- Boas, Harold P. and Emil J. Straube (1999). “Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem: a survey of the L^2 -Sobolev theory”. In: *Several complex variables (Berkeley, CA, 1995–1996)*. Vol. 37. Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, pp. 79–111.
- Herbig, A.-K. and J. D. McNeal (2012). “Convex defining functions for convex domains”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 22.2, pp. 433–454. ISSN: 1050-6926. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-010-9202-8.
- Herbig, A.-K. and J. D. McNeal (2012). “Oka’s lemma, convexity, and intermediate positivity conditions”. In: *Illinois J. Math.* 56.1, 195–211 (2013). ISSN: 0019-2082.
- Fornaess, J. E. and A.-K. Herbig (2007). “A note on plurisubharmonic defining functions in $\mathbb{C}^2$ ”. In: *Math. Z.* 257.4, pp. 769–781. ISSN: 0025-5874. DOI: 10.1007/s00209-007-0143-2.
- Behrens, Mechthild (1985). “Plurisubharmonic defining functions of weakly pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ ”. In: *Math. Ann.* 270.2, pp. 285–296. ISSN: 0025-5831. DOI: 10.1007/BF01456187.
- Diederich, Klas and John Erik Fornaess (1977). “Pseudoconvex domains: existence of Stein neighborhoods”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 44.3, pp. 641–662. ISSN: 0012-7094.
- Biard, Séverine (2014). “On L^2 -estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ on a pseudoconvex domain in a complete Kähler manifold with positive holomorphic bisectional curvature”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 24.3, pp. 1583–1612. ISSN: 1050-6926. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-012-9386-1.
- Diederich, Klas and John Erik Fornaess (1977). “Pseudoconvex domains: an example with nontrivial Nebenhülle”. In: *Math. Ann.* 225.3, pp. 275–292. ISSN: 0025-5831.
- Barrett, David E. (1992). “Behavior of the Bergman projection on the Diederich-Fornaess worm”. In: *Acta Math.* 168.1-2, pp. 1–10. ISSN: 0001-5962. DOI: 10.1007/BF02392975.
- Berndtsson, Bo and Philippe Charpentier (2000). “A Sobolev mapping property of the Bergman kernel”. In: *Math. Z.* 235.1, pp. 1–10. ISSN: 0025-5874. DOI: 10.1007/s002090000099.
- Krantz, Steven G. and Marco M. Peloso (2008). “Analysis and geometry on worm domains”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 18.2, pp. 478–510. ISSN: 1050-6926. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-008-9021-3.
- Fu, Siqi and Mei-Chi Shaw (2016). “The Diederich-Fornaess exponent and non-existence of Stein domains with Levi-flat boundaries”. In: *J. Geom. Anal.* 26.1, pp. 220–230. ISSN: 1050-6926. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-014-9546-6.
- Adachi, Masanori and Judith Brinkschulte (2015). “A global estimate for the Diederich-Fornaess index of weakly pseudoconvex domains”. In: *Nagoya Math. J.* 220, pp. 67–80. ISSN: 0027-7630. DOI: 10.1215/00277630-3335655.
- Petersen, Peter (2006). *Riemannian geometry*. Second. Vol. 171. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, pp. xvi+401. ISBN: 978-0387-29246-5; 0-387-29246-2.
- Lee, John M. (2013). *Introduction to smooth manifolds*. Second. Vol. 218. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, pp. xvi+708. ISBN: 978-1-4419-9981-8.
- Catlin, David (1987). “Subelliptic estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 126.1, pp. 131–191. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1971347.
- McNeal, Jeffery D. (1992). “Lower bounds on the Bergman metric near a point of finite type”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 136.2, pp. 339–360. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/2946608.

Kohn, J. J. (1999). “Quantitative estimates for global regularity”. In: *Analysis and geometry in several complex variables (Katata, 1997)*. Trends Math. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, pp. 97–128.